The Thesis Committee for Emily Ann Lybbert
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following Thesis:

Immigrant Generations: Results from High School to Midlife

APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Chandra Muller, Supervisor

Shannon E. Cavanagh

Immigrant Generations: Results from High School to Midlife

by

Emily Ann Lybbert

Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2020

Dedication

To Tanner. None of this would be possible without your support and love.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful for the generous support of the High School and Beyond Midlife Follow-up project. This material is based upon work supported by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation under grant number2012-10-27, the National Science Foundation under grant numbers HRD 1348527, HRD 1348557, DRL 1420691, DRL 1420330, and DRL 1420572, the Institute for Education Sciences of the U.S. Department of Education under grant numbers R305U140001and R305U180002, the Spencer Foundation under grant number 201500075, and the National Institute on Aging, under award R01AG058719-01A1. This research was also supported by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development under grants numbers P2CHD042849, P2C HD041023, P2C HD047873, and 5 T32 HD007081 (Training Program in Population Studies). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and other funders.

I am also grateful for the feedback I received from my readers, Drs. Muller and Cavanagh, the CMERT group, and my writing group. I also want to thank the technical support I received from our staff members, Dr. Reynolds and Liz Johnson. Finally, a special thanks to my friends and family who supported me during the late nights and frustrated puzzling-throughs, especially my husband Tanner Mitchell.

Abstract

Immigrant Generations: Results from High School to Midlife

Emily Ann Lybbert, MA

The University of Texas at Austin, 2020

Supervisor: Chandra Muller

This thesis examines the relationship between immigrant generation and early adulthood incorporation into higher education and work. Using data from the High School and Beyond Sophomore cohort I explore when and where disparities between the children of immigrants and their native-born, native parent peers emerge. I find that the relationship between immigrant generation and post-secondary education enrollment and early adulthood employment varies by gender. Furthermore, it is at the entry points into higher education and work that disparities emerge. This research indicates that entry into social institutions should be considered as likely sites of inequality and that processes of incorporation may be gendered.

Table of Contents

List of Tables ix

Introduction 1

Background 3

What is immigrant incorporation? 3

How Could Social Institutions affect Incorporation? 6

The Current Study 9

Methods 11

Dependent Variables 12

Post-Secondary Enrollment 12

Bachelor's Degree Completion 13

Early Adulthood Employment 14

Early Adulthood Earnings 14

Independent Variables 15

Immigrant Generation 15

Controls 16

Plan of Analysis 17

Modeling 17

Results 19

Post-Secondary Enrollment 19

Bachelor's Degree Completion 20

Early Adulthood Employment 20

1992 Annual Earnings 21

Discussion 22
Limitations 23
Conclusion 24
Appendix 36
References 37

List of Tables

Table 1. Proportions and Means by Immigrant Generation.....26

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics by Immigrant Generation Status of HS&B Sophomore Cohort 27

Table 3. Results of Logistic Regression Predicting Odds of Post-Secondary Enrollment.....28

Table 4. Results of Logistic Regression Predicting Odds of Bachelor's Degree Completion.....30

Table 5. Results of Logistic Regression Predicting Odds of Employment.....32

Table 6. Results of OLS Regression Predicting Logged Annual Earnings 34

Table A1. Breakdown of Post-Secondary Enrollment among HS&B:So sample 36

Introduction

What does it mean to "fit in?" The process of "fitting in" among immigrants is often called "assimilation" or "incorporation" and is central to research on immigrants and their children (the second generation). Untangling how this process works and under what circumstances immigrants find themselves incorporated is of interest to social scientists and policy makers because of its implications— "not fitting in" is often associated with a lack of resources and opportunities while incorporation is associated with more equality, especially in the United States. One difficulty that immigration research faces is how to examine the long-term effects of migration. Many notable studies have used synthetic cohort designs to examine the incorporation of immigrants and have yielded valuable temporal findings, but are restricted to examine adults (see Borjas 2014; Villarreal and Tamborini 2018). Other studies have used longitudinal data to examine the incorporation of the children of immigrants (see Feliciano and Lanuza 2017; Glick and White 2003; Levels, Dronkers, and Kraaykamp 2008). Research has yet to determine whether immigrant incorporation occurs once or if it is a process that spans across a lifetime.

One mechanism through which immigrant incorporation might be stalled or disrupted across the life course is in the transition into the formal social institutions of school and work. Research on the incorporation of immigrants has yet to examine whether the process of incorporation differs across work and school, which could point to moments where inequalities emerge. Generally, research on adult immigrants is focused on economic outcomes like wages (Villarreal and Tamborini 2018) while research on the

children of immigrants is focused on educational outcomes, like test scores, grades, or overall attainment (Feliciano and Lanuza 2017; Glick and White 2003). However, it's well-established that the process of incorporation into school and work is gendered (England et al. 1994; Jacobs 1996). As such, I consider whether men and women experience differential inequalities by immigration status. Using the High School and Beyond dataset, I test whether second generation immigrants, the U.S. and foreign-born children of at least one immigrant parent, have equal post-secondary enrollment, college completion, employment, and earnings to their third generation or more peers in early adulthood and further examine this relationship by gender. The alternative, however, is that the children of immigrants face barriers to equality, specifically in the transition into higher education and school. I find that native-born, second generation immigrants were significantly less likely to enroll in post-secondary education and be employed full-time, but once in enrolled in higher education or employed, they do not graduate at a lower rate or earn less in income. This relationship, however, is confounded by different outcomes for men and women by immigrant generation. Overall, this study builds off previous research on immigrant generations and assimilation while providing an important step forward in understanding how incorporation is gendered.

Background

WHAT IS IMMIGRANT INCORPORATION?

Assimilation is the process whereby an immigrant adopts the culture, values, and norms of their new host society (Portes and Zhou 1993). Assimilation can also be considered as, "a convenient word to enumerate the ways in which immigrants survive" (Fernandez Kelly and Schauffler 1996, p.30). In the early 1900s, this process was described by sociologists as a purely cultural, "straight-line" process in which immigrants, who were predominantly European, adopted the language and culture of the United States, often eschewing their native culture in favor of becoming American (Portes and Zhou 1993; Waters et al. 2010). During this time period, the process of incorporation was largely successful, in part because of the racial and ethnic homogeneity of the immigrant population. With immigration reforms in 1965, the United States saw a larger wave of migrants from Asia, Africa, South America, and the Caribbean. As the heterogeneity of the immigrant population by race, education, and origin increased, scholars revisited the straight-line theory of incorporation and found the process to be not as straight-forward for this new generation of immigrants, especially when considering the decisions and influences on the children of immigrants, or the second generation (Portes 1996; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Portes and Zhou 1993).

Portes and Zhou (1993) generated a new theory of incorporation known as "segmented assimilation." This theory argues that second generation immigrants have three potential paths: incorporate upwardly into the American White middle-class culture, hold on to their culture of origin and also be upwardly mobile, or assimilate into the

American minority culture to which they correspond (Black, Hispanic, Asian, etc.) and face downward mobility (Portes and Zhou 1993). Studies on this post-1965 second generation of immigrants have found that there is no one way or one process whereby incorporation takes place and the outcomes of all these different paths vary as well (Portes 1996, p.7). More recent research on immigrants often find paradoxical results, especially in health (Hummer et al. 2007; Powers 2013) and education (Feliciano and Lanuza 2017) where immigrants excel, which point to the variety of experiences and backgrounds the current population of U.S. migrants bring.

In general, how well immigrants and the second generation, children of immigrants are doing in the United States depends on what outcome researchers use. Despite their closeness to migration, foreign-born children of immigrants have higher math and English grades (Fuligni 1997), higher rates of high school completion (Perreira et al. 2006), and more years of schooling (Feliciano and Lanuza 2017) than third generation peers of similar race or ethnicity. Results for native-born, second-generation children are mixed as they tend to not do as well in educational outcomes as their foreign-born peers (Perreira et al. 2006). This paradox in education is generally attributed to the selectivity of migrants overall and their relative advantage as compared to their countries of origin (Feliciano 2005a; Feliciano and Lanuza 2017).

In the High School and Beyond Sophomore cohort, second generation students have lower math and reading scores their sophomore year, but by their senior year of high school there are no significant differences in test scores between the children of immigrants and the third or more generation (Glick and White 2003). These results

suggest that in the HS&B cohort second generation immigrants are closing the test score gap with their third or more generation peers by the time they graduate from high school. Along with other research on education, it seems as though the children of immigrants in U.S. schools are able to "catch up" with their third generation peers and implies that there should not be any further differences by immigrant generation in educational outcomes.

When it comes to work, the processes by which immigrants incorporate are much more complicated. Generally, research on work and migration is centered on first generation adult immigrants, not their children. Despite this limitation, economic outcomes for migrants are considered a useful barometer for overall incorporation and inclusion in a society (Borjas 2014; Fernandez Kelly and Schauffler 1996). Overall, immigrants have lower wages than native U.S. workers (Borjas 2014; Drange and Helland 2019), but over their lives this gap appears to close, although at different rates by ethnicity (Villarreal and Tamborini 2018). The speed of wage incorporation matters to the extent that quick immigrant integration into the economy, results in higher wages and overall wage growth among migrants (Painter and Sanderson 2017). Despite immigrant workers relative advantage in their country of origin (Feliciano 2005b), they experience an occupational downgrading upon arrival to their country of destination (Chiswick, Lee, and Miller 2005; Fellini and Guetto 2019). In general, the success of immigrants in finding work for which they are qualified and earning equal pay as their native coworkers depends largely on the social structure of their host country and the power structure of their workplaces and occupational field (see Fellini and Guetto 2019; Heizmann, Busch-Heizmann, and Holst 2017; Painter and Sanderson 2017; Tomaskovic-Devey, Hällsten,

and Avent-Holt 2015). These results indicate that immigrant incorporation in work is made up of multiple pathways that are context specific.

When Portes and Zhou generated their theory of segmented assimilation, they were responding to what they and other researchers were beginning to observe in the post-1965 immigrant population—unequal and heterogenous incorporation into U.S. society. Unlike straight-line assimilation processes, modern immigrant incorporation is not as simple as learning English and watching the NFL. Portes and Zhou (1993) attribute this heterogeneity in incorporation to the variability in immigrant ethnicity and origin, which influences immigrant reception and how they view themselves in relation to the native U.S. population. However, neither theory of assimilation discussed question if incorporation is a one-time, all-encompassing event in an immigrant's life or if it is a process that must be undergone multiple times throughout a lifetime. I build on segmented assimilation theory and previous research by comparing the role the formal social institutions of school and work play in the processes of incorporation.

HOW COULD SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS AFFECT INCORPORATION?

Emile Durkheim described social institutions as, "all the beliefs and modes of behavior instituted by the collectivity" (Durkheim 1982, p.45), or in other words, social institutions are made up by groups of people to organize beliefs and behavior. Berger and Luckmann further explain that social institutions are not built instantaneously, but are rather created by its history and control human conduct through "predefined patterns of conduct" (Berger and Luckmann 1990, p.55). In short, social institutions provide a

framework for individuals to understand what and who they are supposed to be. All social institutions fall on a spectrum of formality; some institutions have written rules that are akin to laws and government while others rely on norms and values to enforce behavior. The family is the first social institution through which people learn what is right and wrong and how to perceive themselves in relation to others and is an informal institution. More formal institutions, like school and work, require admittance and have written rules and bureaucracy built into them. This study focuses on the transition into and success within the more formal institutions of higher education and work by immigrant generation. These more formal institutions act as gatekeepers, keeping some groups of people out or immobile while accepting and accelerating other groups on a path of success within the institution (see Williams 1992). The unequal incorporation of some immigrant groups into the U.S. institutions of school and work is indicative of who or what is valued by those institutions.

Research on immigrant incorporation often uses one measurement, like wages or graduation rates, to test if there are differences. However, when considering that wages are determined by the larger social structure of work and graduation rates by school, it is certainly possible that the process of earning the same amount or graduating at the same rate as the native-born, non-immigrant population is different across social institutions. Furthermore, entry into social institutions could be another moment in an individual's lifetime where they are accepted in, and receive the benefits of membership in an institution, or rejected. My research takes this perspective and examines not just how second-generation immigrants do in higher education (graduation) and work (income) but

how likely they are to enter into these institutions in the first place, through postsecondary enrollment and full-time employment in early adulthood.

Gender, race, and class are often the key dimensions by which differential entry and success within social institutions is observed. As explained in the section above, most research on how the children of immigrants are accepted or rejected by social institutions is tied to ethnic and racial differences. Gender in the U.S. context, however, is tightly linked to inequalities in higher education and work and some scholars have called for studies of migration to pay closer attention to how migration processes may be gendered (Pedraza 1991; Pessar 1999; Pessar and Mahler 2003). Since these calls to action, researchers have found unique patterns for how female immigrants work (England, Garcia-Beaulieu, and Ross 2004; McManus and Apgar 2019), marry (John 2019; McManus and Apgar 2019), and influence migration flows (Curran and Rivero-Fuentes 2003; Hughes 2019).

When it comes to how the female children of immigrants incorporate into school and work, available research is limited although it is has been suggested that they face gendered expectations from their families that result in barriers to higher education (Lee and Zhou 2015). Women overall experience further gendered experiences in higher education in their enrollment and progress through these institutions. Women are clustered into college majors, like the arts and humanities, that provide less economic returns to degrees (Bobbitt-Zeher 2007; Bradley 2000; Charles and Bradley 2002). Furthermore, women are overrepresented at post-secondary institutions that are lower prestige or do not offer baccalaureate degrees (Lester and Klein 2017). Given the

prevalence of gender disparities in school and work in the United States broadly, I also test whether entrance into and success in school and work are different by generational status for women and men.

THE CURRENT STUDY

Longitudinal data, like the High School and Beyond Study (HS&B), provide a fuller picture of the incorporation of immigrant generations. Gaps might exist in high school between generations (Glick and White 2003), but the transition to early adulthood and opportunities of entry into college and work could provide another moment to observe resistance to or support of immigrant incorporation. In 1992, a follow-up was conducted for the HS&B Sophomore Cohort respondents which contains information on respondents' early adulthood educational experiences, employment, and earnings. Using these data, we answer the question, do second generation immigrants face new barriers to incorporation in a period of life transition? Previous research on this HS&B cohort suggest that there should not be any differences by immigrant generation (Glick and White 2003), and so I test the hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Second generation immigrants are just as likely to enroll in higher education and are as likely to graduate as compared to their native-born, third or more generation peers.

Hypothesis 2: Second generation immigrants are just as likely to be employed full time and earn the same income as the native-born, third or more generation persons.

Hypothesis 3: The process of incorporation, or the equality or inequality across immigrant generation statuses, will not differ by gender.

The results of this study indicate that it is in the entry into institutions where second-generation immigrants are disadvantaged and that this disadvantage is possible to mitigate in some institutional contexts.

Methods

I use data from the sophomore cohort of High School and Beyond (HS&B:So). The HS&B study began in 1980 with a nationally representative sample of high school sophomores. A panel sample of 14,825 respondents from the original sophomore sample was followed up in subsequent years. These sample members were surveyed in 1982, 1984, 1986, 1992, and most recently in 2014. For this study, I use data from all waves except for 2014. My analytic sample consists of respondents who participated in the 1980-1992 surveys and were non-missing across all independent variables. For each dependent variable, the analytic sample size varies based on response patterns. These samples vary from 11,300 with college degree information to 10,040 respondents who report earnings. Missing information is imputed using other available information when possible, for example if a respondent did not respond in 1986 to their post-secondary enrollment but they did in 1992, the available information is used to determine a respondent's status. I then use list-wise deletion for all remaining missing cases. Table 1 shows the distribution of the dependent variables predicted by immigrant generation and Table 2 reports the distribution of independent variables by immigrant generation with sample sizes for each immigrant group.

This sample is ideal to examine the transition to adulthood by immigrant generation for several reasons. First, this sample consists of immigrants who migrated after the U.S. migration policies of 1965. This means that the subsample of first- and second-generation immigrants are racially diverse with a large proportion of Hispanics and a growing number of Asian immigrants, resembling modern migration patterns. Secondly, this sample came of age during a time period of expanding higher education where more students were deciding to attend college rather than enter the work force right away. This cohort of

students was also entering college during a time period that saw greater numbers of female enrollment, a trend that has grown in prevalence to today (Buchmann and DiPrete 2006). Finally, due to the longitudinal design of the HS&B:So survey, I am able to observe in detail the time period between adolescence and adulthood. This includes information on high school test scores as well as college transcripts that give a better picture of the training these respondents received on their way to adulthood. While this sample has now aged into middle and late adulthood, analyzing their transition to adulthood can indicate the challenges present-day first- and second-generation immigrant adolescents might face.

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

In order to achieve a more complete picture of status in early adulthood, I predict 4 dependent variables: post-secondary enrollment, college degree attainment, employment, and yearly earnings (see Table 1). Below I explain in further detail how each of these outcomes are measured.

Post-Secondary Enrollment

Post-secondary enrollment is measured in 1986 and in 1992 and is coded as a dichotomous outcome (1 = ever enrolled in post-secondary, 0 = never enrolled). Here, post-secondary enrollment includes any program, training, college, or university that respondents attended after high school graduation for professional certification or a college degree (Associates or Bachelors). This information was gathered from post-secondary institution transcripts and for respondents who were missing transcript data, filled in using self-reported enrollment information. For post-secondary enrollment, I use 1992 as a cutoff date in order to capture respondents who may not have responded in 1986 as well as respondents who did not immediately enter higher education after high school. In total,

67.47% or approximately 8490 respondents of the analytic sample had some post-secondary training. A breakdown of this group by type of post-secondary institution attended is available in Table A1. By using transcript information, I have more accurate, administrative records of whether a respondent was ever enrolled in a post-secondary program which increases the reliability of this measure. Furthermore, by using 1992 as the cutoff I can observe more pathways into higher education while respondents are still young adults.

Bachelor's Degree Completion

Like post-secondary enrollment, bachelor's degree completion is measured in 1992 and as a dichotomous outcome (1 = bachelor's degree, 0 = Less than bachelor's degree) and is derived from transcript information and self-reports. Unlike post-secondary enrollment, only 25.44% of the analytic sample graduated with a bachelor's degree, with 25.39% of women holding at least a bachelor's degree and 25.22% of men. For this same age cohort, the population-level estimate for bachelor's degree completion was around 32% with men slightly more likely to have a degree than women, although this trend was beginning to shift to a more women enrolling in higher education (Buchmann and DiPrete 2006; Ryan and Bauman 2016). Previous work using the HS&B samples have found consistent gaps between post-secondary enrollment and actual baccalaureate degree completion (Ganderton and Santos 1995; Sandy, Gonzalez, and Hilmer 2006). This age cohort was affected by expanding higher education, especially in the growth of 2-year colleges, and so more students attended post-secondary institutions but this growth did not translate into an increase in 4-year degrees (Sandy et al. 2006). These previous findings and population-level estimates indicate that degree completion among the HS&B:So

sample was not unusual for the context in which they entered higher education and gives confidence in the reliability of this measure.

Early Adulthood Employment

In 1992, respondents were asked about their employment status and whether they were searching for work. Respondents who reported working for pay in the last week prior to the survey, whether part-time or full-time, are considered employed at early adulthood. Under this definition, 80.6% of the sample were employed in 1992. This measure is also measured dichotomously. Typically, research on employment differentiates between part-time and full-time employment, which is especially relevant for gender inequalities in employment. However, a limitation of the self-reported measure for employment status that I use is that it does not differentiate between full or part-time employment. I address this limitation by estimating models by gender, as women are far more likely to work part-time, especially conditional on marital status (Rosenfeld and Birkelund 1995).

Early Adulthood Earnings

Respondents reported their annual earnings in 1992. This measurement is continuous and is not cut-off at a maximum value. Annual earnings for this sample range from $0 to $800,000, in 1992 dollars. Overall, the average yearly earnings for this sample is $9,476.24. The median annual income for this sample is $6000, due to the large number of respondents with an income of $0. Annual income is logged, but in such a way to retain the valid zeroes for unemployed respondents. In the following analyses, logged annual income is predicted. The strength of this measurement is that unlike in many other surveys, income is not categorized or placed into "bins." Rather, exact values for each respondent is reported, even if that value is $0.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Immigrant Generation

Immigrant generation is constructed from four survey questions that ask: "Were you born in the United States?" "How long have you lived in the United States?" "How long has your father lived in the United States?" "How long has your mother lived in the United States?" Using these survey questions, I create four categories of immigrant generation: foreign-born, later arrivals; foreign-born, early arrivals; native-born, second generation immigrants; and native-born, third or later generation. "Foreign-born, later arrivals" and "Foreign-born, early arrivals" both represent second generation children who migrated with their parents to the United States (also known as the "1.5 generation" in other research) but differ in the timing of migration. "Foreign-born, later arrivals" are respondents who migrated with their parents within 6 years of their Sophomore year of high school. "Foreign-born, early arrivals" migrated with their parents to the United States, earlier than the 6-year window for "Foreign-born, later arrivals." "Native-born, second generation immigrants" are those who were born in the United States but at least one of their parents has not lived in the United States their whole lives. Finally, the "third or later generation" are respondents who were born in the United States and both parents have lived in the United States their whole lives. While precise citizenship status is unknown for respondents and their parents, I can use all four of these survey questions to estimate a respondent's immigrant generation. Having information on a respondent's parents' migration history is essential to estimating immigrant generation and a strength of this measure is the inclusion and availability of that information.

Table 1 shows the mean or proportions for the four outcomes by immigrant generation status. Foreign-born, later arrivals, or those respondents who migrated with their parents during later childhood or adolescence, appear to be much more likely to enroll in a post-secondary program, complete a college degree, and earn more than any other group. For employment, this same group are just as likely to be employed in 1992 as the third generation. Overall, the native-born, second generation group of respondents have the lowest rates of post-secondary enrollment, graduation, employment, and earn considerably less than any other group. This indicates that they are more disadvantaged, a finding that should reappear in the regression models, especially the baseline estimations.

Controls

I include controls from the 1980 survey that have been used in prior research to analyze immigrant generations (Glick and White 2003). These measurements include gender, whether the respondent was age 17 in 1980 (ages ranged from 13 to 21 years old), if the respondent was ever held back a grade, and family socioeconomic status. SES is a standardized measure based on parents' education, income, and father's occupation that is included in the 1980 base year data file. I also constructed dummy variables for family structure based on parents' union status and how many siblings the respondent had in 1980. Finally, the HS&B:So survey includes a language supplement that has detailed information on respondents' language use and what language is spoken in their homes. Based on what languages were spoken in their homes, respondents were classified as having home language backgrounds as follows: non-English; bilingual, non-English dominant; bilingual, English dominant; and English only. The distribution of these measurements by immigrant generation status is available in Table 2.

Furthermore, I control on cognitive skills by using math test scores from 1982 which have been standardized across the sample. I also control on marital status in 1992 in predicting employment status and earnings. Whether the respondent is married or not is particularly important in understanding these relationships by gender, as women who are married are less likely to be employed formally and in conjunction earn less. Overall, I can achieve a more precise understanding of the role immigrant generation plays in the transition to early adulthood by eliminating some of the confounding predictors of this transition, like cognitive skills (test scores) and family background. These controls are all associated with college-going, college completion, employment, and earnings in some way and having access to this background information is a strength of this study.

PLAN OF ANALYSIS

Modeling

In order to examine how early adulthood status varies by immigrant generation, I predict postsecondary enrollment, Bachelor's degree completion, early adult employment and annual earnings for the HS&B Sophomore cohort. Model 1 displays the baseline relationship between immigrant generation and the outcome of interest. Model 2 adds all the demographic controls to examine to what extent this relationship is an artifact of race or class background. Finally, in Model 3 I add the controls for language background and math test scores to examine how measures of skill affect the relationship between immigrant generation and the outcome. For all dichotomous measures, multinomial logistic regression is used to predict the odds of the outcome and odds-ratios are reported in the tables. For logged 1992 earnings, ordinary least squared linear regression is used. As selection into higher education and employment varies by gender, I address this issue by

estimating all results separately by gender. Furthermore, I use HS&B:So 1992 sampling weight throughout in order to account for the clustered sampling design of HS&B.

One of the substantial questions I raise is whether there is a difference between entering a social institution or progressing within the institution. To address this question, I model bachelor's degree completion only for respondents who reported ever being enrolled in a post-secondary program. I use the same logic in modeling yearly earnings among respondents who reported being employed. This allows me to differentiate between the entry into higher education or employment and what happens within these structures.

In the tables below, I report estimates for immigrant generation, language background, and math test scores. For employment and earnings, the effect of having a bachelor's degree is also reported. Language background, math scores, and having a bachelor's degree are individual characteristics that are skills (or in the case of a bachelor's degree, accreditation) respondents attain that directly influence the likelihood that respondents will be selected into higher education or employment. Furthermore, language background is often used in studies of immigrant outcomes as a proxy for incorporation or culture (Thomson and Hoffman-Goetz 2009) and is non-randomly distributed across immigrant generations. Having a non-English or less-English language background for immigrants may be detrimental in that they may possess lower English language skills, which are essential for higher education and work in the United States. However, a non-English language background could also be beneficial for the children of immigrants in that it allows them to navigate seemingly separate social networks; ethnic enclaves that value non-English language ability and the broader institutions of higher education and work that require English skills (Glick and White 2003). Overall, these measures are of particular interest to this study because they may be mechanisms through which the effect of immigrant generation is functioning.

Results

POST-SECONDARY ENROLLMENT

Results of predicting post-secondary enrollment is available in Table 3. In predicting the odds of post-secondary enrollment, respondents of the second generation are less likely to enter these institutions, among both men and women. This relationship is statistically significant in the baseline model (Model 1) but not once I control for background characteristics (Model 2). Further consistent across men and women is that non-English or bilingual language backgrounds and math test scores are positively associated with enrolling in a post-secondary program. This indicates that non-English language backgrounds may not be about English language skills (something colleges and universities in the United States require) but perhaps foreign language skills or some other form of capital valued by higher education.

Where the effect of generational status between men and women diverges is among the foreign-born groups. Net of background controls, foreign-born and native-born women do not have different odds of enrolling in a post-secondary program. Among men however, there are diverging outcomes for foreign-born, later arrivals and foreign-born, early arrivals. Foreign-born, later arrivals, or men who migrated with their parents to the U.S. during their school years were significantly more likely to be enrolled in a post-secondary program than their third-generation peers. Men who migrated with their parents prior to formal schooling (foreign-born, early arrivals) were significantly less likely than their third-generation peers to enter higher education. These findings indicate that 1) the overall relationship between generational status and post-secondary enrollment differs by gender and should be considered carefully and 2) among men, the timing of migration matters in explaining the relationship between generational status and post-secondary enrollment.

BACHELOR'S DEGREE COMPLETION

Table 4 reports the results of predicting bachelor's degree completion among respondents who were ever enrolled in a post-secondary program. In contrast to estimating post-secondary enrollment, neither generational status nor language background were significantly associated with completing a 4-year degree. Math test scores, however, were still significantly and positively associated with completing a bachelor's degree. Furthermore, the relationship between generational status and bachelor's degree attainment does not appear to be different by gender. These findings in conjunction indicate that the characteristics that mattered for entering higher education (generational status and language background) do not necessarily matter for the successful navigation of higher education. The implication of these findings is that while different immigrant generations may be advantaged or disadvantaged in comparison to their third-generation peers in entry to higher education, they do not appear to be either advantaged or disadvantaged in the completion of higher education.

EARLY ADULTHOOD EMPLOYMENT

Table 5 reports the results of predicting employment in 1992. Here, generational status is once again associated with the outcome of interest, in a way that mirrors the findings for post-secondary enrollment. First, the relationship between generational status and employment is different by gender. Second-generation women are significantly less likely to be employed than third-generation women and this finding persists net of background controls, language background, math scores, or even holding a college degree. This pattern is different among men, where foreign-born, later arrivals are significantly more likely to be employed, net of these same controls. Furthermore, unlike for post-secondary enrollment, language background does not provide any sort of advantage (or

disadvantage) and is not significantly associated with employment. Overall, these findings indicate that when it comes to the relationship between immigrant generation and the outcome, there is something similar between post-secondary enrollment and early adulthood employment. At this point in the life course, both measures function as entry-points into the institutions of higher education and work, respectively.

1992 Annual Earnings

Finally, the OLS results of predicting 1992 earnings is available in Table 6 and similarly to the relationship between post-secondary enrollment and bachelor's degree completion, the relationship observed between employment and generational status is not observed for earnings. Among foreign-born, later arrival men, there appears to be an advantage in earnings which is consistent with employment and post-secondary enrollment, until I control for having a bachelor's degree (Model 3). Among women, there is no relationship between generational status and earnings, although in contrast to employment women who are bilingual, non-English language have on average, higher earnings than women who only speak English. Overall, similarly to what I observe in the relationship between post-secondary enrollment and bachelor's degree completion, the advantages or disadvantages that are associated with immigrant generation and employment do not affect earnings once an individual has a job.

Discussion

Over the course of this paper, I have considered whether immigrant incorporation is a process that is straight-forward or whether the social context surrounding incorporation affects this process. Previous findings for this cohort indicated that the gap between second generation immigrants and their native-born, native-parentage peers was closing, at least in terms of test scores (Glick and White 2003; White and Glick 2009). However, revisiting the HS&B Sophomores as they transitioned to early adulthood revealed significant disparities by immigrant generation in the odds of enrolling in a post-secondary institution or being employed in early adulthood. These disparities were gendered in ways that disadvantaged female second-generation immigrants. Despite the gains these children of immigrants made in high school, entry into higher education was more difficult for them, net of demographic characteristics, race and ethnicity, and language background. The results for men were more split: foreign-born men who migrated later in their schooling were more likely to enroll in a post-secondary program while foreign-born men who migrated earlier in their schooling (more akin to the "1.5 generation" in other literature) were less likely to enroll. Furthermore, second-generation women were significantly less likely to be employed, regardless of nativity, while second-generation men were more likely or not different from third-generation men. Overall, it seems that women who are the children of immigrants face additional barriers to entering higher education and work that their male peers do not.

In the entry to higher education, some immigrant characteristics like race and ethnicity and a foreign language background were associated with enrolling and for women, college graduation. This finding is suggestive of the pathway to upward assimilation through holding onto native ethnic culture described in segmented

assimilation theory (Portes and Zhou 1993), but also the discrimination Latina women may be facing in higher education. Ethnic and language backgrounds were less important in determining entry into the labor market. What is it about higher education that values some immigrant characteristics, while work values none of the same characteristics? These results indicate the importance of considering the context of the institutions into which immigrants are incorporating; the processes may vary across institutions.

LIMITATIONS

Although the findings of this analysis add further understanding to how immigrant incorporation plays out across the life course, there are several limitations that should be addressed by future research. First, although our sample consists of 2690 second generation immigrants, there are not enough to truly disentangle the heterogeneity of this sample. There are especially few foreign-born respondents, who likely face a very different process of incorporation. With a larger sample, it would be possible to not only disentangle the different processes of incorporation by nativity, but also by ethnicity and specific languages spoken.

Secondly, this sample is unique in terms of its historical context. Immigration today looks very different than this sample of high school sophomores in 1980. For example, this sample has a large number of Cuban immigrants and very few Asian or Middle-Eastern immigrants. It would be interesting to see how the transition to early adulthood for millennial second generation immigrants has affected incorporation processes, perhaps using data from the High School Longitudinal Survey of 2009 (HSLS:09).

Finally, when considering the outcomes for immigrants and their children, there is no way to fully control for the selection processes that lead to migration. Previous research has attempted to show just how select migrants are, as compared to the communities they

leave behind (Feliciano 2005b, 2005a). This important characteristic of migrants is almost impossible to empirically adjust for and the effect selection may have on incorporation processes will be difficult to examine. However, despite these limitations this study has shown that 1) incorporation is a process that spans the life of immigrants and is visible at moments of transition into social institutions and 2) when considering processes of assimilation or incorporation, the social structures surrounding this process (like gender, or the social context of the institution) matter for who is excluded from the process.

CONCLUSION

When considering the social inequalities that exist for immigrants in the United States, it is common (and rightfully so) to examine these inequalities under the lens of racial and ethnic identities. This study has found that inequalities by immigrant generation are also gendered, with different pathways to equality or inequality for men and women. Furthermore, the process of incorporating into formal institutions like school and work is blocked at the entry into higher education and employment. Together, these findings are important for policy aimed at increasing social equality and opportunities for immigrants. Future research should revisit educational outcomes for immigrants and non-immigrants in more recent cohorts, separating analysis by boys and girls in order to determine if the differential pathways observed in the HS&B cohort have persisted. Furthermore, this research can be extended using the High School and Beyond 2014 Midlife survey, which is now available through NCES. Unequal entry into higher education and the labor force have likely had huge implications for the development of wealth among this sample, which could be observed in the Midlife survey.

In summary, this study shows that opportunities for inequality can arise in the transition into formal institutions. Despite appearing equal in test scores when these

students graduated high school, entering higher education and then entering the labor force as young adults led to unequal outcomes for the children of immigrants. This pattern of inequality was especially prevalent for women and indicates that second-generation women confront unique structural barriers to entry into school and work in young adulthood that likely impact the trajectory of their whole lives.

Table 1. Proportions and Means by Immigrant Generation

	Foreign-Born, Later Arrival	Foreign-Born, Early Arrivals	Native-Born, Second Generation	Third or More Generation	Total
Post-Secondary Enrollment	0.7877	0.6486	0.5817	0.6834	0.6734
N					*11,160*
College Degree	0.3182	0.2355	0.172	0.2622	0.2531
N					*11,300*
Employed	0.7937	0.7992	0.7456	0.8127	0.8057
N					*10,940*
Yearly Earnings	11546.36	11304.99	8348.923	9419.852	9397.181
Standard Error	*1852.898*	*905.2359*	*533.6578*	*162.1759*	*152.9276*
N					*10,040*

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, High School and Beyond (HS&B) 1980-2014 Update Restricted-use Data File.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics by Immigrant Generation Status of HS&B Sophomore Cohort

	Foreign-Born, Later Arrival	Foreign-Born, Early Arrivals	Native-Born, Second Generation	Third or More Generation
SES	-0.46	0.00	-0.30	-0.02
Standard Error	*0.09*	*0.05*	*0.03*	*0.01*
Gender				
Female	0.50	0.50	0.57	0.51
Male	0.50	0.50	0.43	0.49
Age 17 or older in 1980	0.19	0.05	0.07	0.03
Previous retention in grade	0.26	0.15	0.21	0.13
Family structure				
Both parents	0.70	0.73	0.56	0.72
Parent and partner	0.05	0.07	0.11	0.09
Single mother	0.17	0.12	0.24	0.13
Single father	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03
Neither parent	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.03
Family size				
No siblings	0.01	0.05	0.07	0.06
1-2 siblings	0.39	0.48	0.37	0.45
Three or more siblings	0.61	0.47	0.56	0.49
Race/Ethnicity				
Non-Hispanic white	0.36	0.58	0.57	0.82
Non-Hispanic black	0.13	0.10	0.27	0.10
Mexican	0.14	0.08	0.09	0.04
Puerto Rican	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02
Other Hispanics	0.11	0.14	0.05	0.02
Asian	0.26	0.09	0.02	0.00
Language Background				
Non-English	0.22	0.07	0.04	0.01
Bilingual, non-English dominant	0.29	0.20	0.06	0.01
Bilingual, English dominant	0.18	0.19	0.16	0.08
English Only	0.30	0.54	0.74	0.90
Math Test Score 1982	-0.71	-0.57	-0.89	-0.39
Standard Error	*0.36*	*0.11*	*0.07*	*0.02*
N	220	700	1520	10590

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, High School and Beyond (HS&B) 1980-2014 Update Restricted-use Data File.

Table 3. Results of Logistic Regression Predicting Odds of Post-Secondary Enrollment.

	Women			Men		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Generational Status (vs. third or later generation)						
Foreign-Born, Later Arrivals	0.884	1.258	0.760	4.212***	8.874***	11.54**
Foreign-Born, Early Arrivals	1.135	1.001	0.705	0.675	0.603	0.531*
Native-Born, Second Generation	0.667***	0.834	0.783	0.591***	0.715	0.700
Language Background (vs. English only)						
Non-English			5.444***			2.177*
Bilingual, non-English dominant			2.739***			2.513**
Bilingual, English dominant			2.294***			1.367
Math Test Score 1982			1.267***			1.413***
SES		3.160***	3.015***		3.016***	2.800***
Age 17 or older in 1980		0.483**	0.547*		0.536**	0.659
Previous retention in grade		0.676**	0.737*		0.640***	0.785*
Family structure (vs. both parents)						
Parent and Partner		0.652**	0.689*		0.940	0.982
Single mother		1.178	1.287*		1.392*	1.461**
Single father		0.705	0.682		1.256	1.315
Neither parent		0.397***	0.470**		0.622*	0.747
Family size (vs. 1-2 siblings)						
No siblings		1.145	1.191		0.650*	0.684*
Three or more siblings		0.734***	0.729***		0.726***	0.707***
Race/Ethnicity (vs. non-Hispanic white)						
Non-Hispanic black		2.121***	2.462***		1.270	1.556**
Mexican		1.183	0.833		1.161	0.923
Puerto Rican		0.967	0.634		0.875	0.726
Other Hispanics		1.006	0.925		0.804	0.809
Asian		4.202**	2.325		7.452***	4.684**

Table 3, cont.

Constant	2.514***	3.826***	3.935***	1.852***	2.493***	2.628***
Observations	5,850	5,850	5,850	5,300	5,300	5,300

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, High School and Beyond (HS&B) 1980-2014 Update Restricted-use Data File.

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Table 4. Results of Logistic Regression Predicting Odds of Bachelor's Degree Completion

	Women			Men		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Generational Status (vs. third or later generation)						
Foreign-Born, Later Arrivals	1.207	1.875	1.336	0.942	1.830	1.639
Foreign-Born, Early Arrivals	0.901	0.790	0.715	0.948	0.968	1.052
Native-Born, Second Generation	0.581**	0.767	0.692	0.859	1.128	1.223
Language Background (vs. English only)						
Non-English			2.361			1.360
Bilingual, non-English dominant			1.486			1.061
Bilingual, English dominant			1.236			0.972
Math Test Score 1982			1.643***			1.577***
SES		3.079***	2.792***		2.414***	2.227***
Age 17 or older		0.171**	0.263**		0.349	0.492
Previous retention in grade		0.590**	0.753		0.572***	0.743
Family structure (vs. both parents)						
Parent and Partner		0.656*	0.705		0.774	0.781
Single mother		0.926	0.993		0.945	0.954
Single father		0.901	1.011		1.243	1.315
Neither parent		0.512	0.602		0.365*	0.432*
Family size (vs. 1-2 siblings)						
No siblings		0.862	0.854		0.967	0.972
Three or more siblings		0.845	0.822*		1.075	1.081
Race/Ethnicity (vs. non-Hispanic white)						
Non-Hispanic black		0.733*	1.001		0.685*	0.917
Mexican		0.485**	0.544*		0.522*	0.597
Puerto Rican		0.416*	0.506		0.489	0.531
Other Hispanics		0.426***	0.448***		0.782	0.939
Asian		2.922***	2.225*		1.844*	1.528

Table 4, cont.

Constant	0.589***	0.644***	0.608***	0.663***	0.594***	0.505***
Observations	4,320	4,320	4,320	3,630	3,630	3,630

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, High School and Beyond (HS&B) 1980-2014 Update Restricted-use Data File.

Consists of post-secondary enrolled respondents only

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Table 5. Results of Logistic Regression Predicting Odds of Employment

	Women			Men		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Generational Status (vs. third or later generation)						
Foreign-Born, Later Arrivals	0.629	0.606	0.539	1.932	2.683*	2.927*
Foreign-Born, Early Arrivals	0.912	0.821	0.806	0.886	0.989	1.058
Native-Born, Second Generation	0.588***	0.615***	0.632***	1.103	1.279	1.341
Language Background (vs. English only)						
Non-English			1.109			0.938
Bilingual, non-English dominant			1.166			0.766
Bilingual, English dominant			0.843			0.858
Math Test Score 1982			1.065*			1.075*
Bachelor's Degree 1992			1.537***			1.186
SES		1.183**	1.068		1.006	0.942
Age 17 or older in 1980		0.680	0.729		0.902	0.956
Previous retention in grade		0.823	0.859		0.717*	0.762
Family structure (vs. both parents)						
Parent and Partner		0.770	0.791		0.863	0.865
Single mother		0.876	0.877		0.829	0.824
Single father		1.480	1.515		0.516*	0.511*
Neither parent		0.660	0.705		0.670	0.702
Family size (vs. 1-2 siblings)						
No siblings		1.040	1.067		1.195	1.205
Three or more siblings		0.840*	0.860		0.864	0.869
Married in 1992		0.514***	0.531***		1.796***	1.793***
Race/Ethnicity (vs. non-Hispanic white)						
Non-Hispanic black		0.889	0.908		0.913	0.938
Mexican		1.030	1.087		0.807	0.898
Puerto Rican		0.927	0.956		0.557	0.610
Other Hispanics		1.467	1.553		1.012	1.099

Table 5, cont.

Asian		1.859	1.677		0.431*	0.433*
Constant	3.013***	5.564***	4.955***	7.158***	7.076***	6.935***
Observations	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,240	5,240	5,240

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, High School and Beyond (HS&B) 1980-2014 Update Restricted-use Data File.

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Table 6. Results of OLS Regression Predicting Logged Annual Earnings

	Women			Men		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Generational Status (vs. third or later generation)						
Foreign-Born, Later Arrivals	-1.166	-1.177	-1.414	0.592**	0.565*	0.450
Foreign-Born, Early Arrivals	0.558	0.528	0.312	-0.169	-0.232	-0.247
Native-Born, Second Generation	-0.328	-0.210	-0.257	-0.549*	-0.434	-0.444
Language Background (vs. English only)						
Non-English			0.670			0.0907
Bilingual, non-English dominant			0.808**			0.110
Bilingual, English dominant			0.191			0.200
Math Test Score 1982			0.0610			0.0230
Bachelor's Degree 1992			0.382**			0.418**
SES		0.315***	0.218*		-0.0506	-0.149
Age 17 or older in 1980		-0.789	-0.705		-0.618*	-0.567
Previous retention in grade		-0.650**	-0.597**		-0.245	-0.194
Family structure (vs. both parents)						
Parent and Partner		0.229	0.294		-0.251	-0.229
Single mother		0.407*	0.447**		-0.219	-0.225
Single father		0.0224	0.0466		-0.247	-0.270
Neither parent		-0.849	-0.751		-0.0438	0.0214
Family size (vs. 1-2 siblings)						
No siblings		-0.0172	-0.0184		-0.219	-0.196
Three or more siblings		-0.00171	0.0144		0.0553	0.0590
Married in 1992		-0.161	-0.121		0.462***	0.467***
Race/Ethnicity (vs. non-Hispanic white)						
Non-Hispanic black		-0.231	-0.171		-0.492*	-0.453*
Mexican		0.134	-0.0361		0.0930	0.0608
Puerto Rican		0.0155	-0.273		-0.645	-0.654

Table 6, cont.

Other Hispanics		0.209	0.172		0.271	0.287
Asian		0.385	0.0129		0.329	0.170
Constant	7.660***	7.805***	7.637***	8.207***	8.123***	7.985***
Observations	4,210	4,210	4,210	4,540	4,540	4,540
R-squared	0.003	0.025	0.031	0.003	0.022	0.026

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, High School and Beyond (HS&B) 1980-2014 Update Restricted-use Data File.

Consists of employed respondents only

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Appendix

Table A1. Breakdown of Post-Secondary Enrollment among HS&B:So sample

Ever Enrolled in a Post-Secondary Program	67.47% of total sample
4-Year College	*58.46% of enrolled*
JUCO or Community College	*24.80% of enrolled*
Vocational Training	*12.06% of enrolled*

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, High School and Beyond (HS&B) 1980-2014 Update Restricted-use Data File.

References

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. 1990. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.

Bobbitt-Zeher, Donna. 2007. "The Gender Income Gap and the Role of Education." *Sociology of Education* 80(1):1–22.

Borjas, George J. 2014. *Immigration Economics*. Harvard University Press.

Bradley, Karen. 2000. "The Incorporation of Women into Higher Education: Paradoxical Outcomes?" *Sociology of Education* 73(1):1–18.

Buchmann, Claudia, and Thomas A. DiPrete. 2006. "The Growing Female Advantage in College Completion: The Role of Family Background and Academic Achievement." *American Sociological Review* 71(4):515–41.

Charles, Maria, and Karen Bradley. 2002. "Equal but Separate? A Cross-National Study of Sex Segregation in Higher Education." *American Sociological Review* 67(4):573–99.

Chiswick, Barry R., Yew Liang Lee, and Paul W. Miller. 2005. "A Longitudinal Analysts of Immigrant Occupational Mobility: A Test of the Immigrant Assimilation Hypothesis." *International Migration Review* 39(2):332–53.

Curran, Sara R., and Estela Rivero-Fuentes. 2003. "Engendering Migrant Networks: The Case of Mexican Migration." *Demography* 40(2):289–307.

Drange, Ida, and Håvard Helland. 2019. "The Sheltering Effect of Occupational Closure? Consequences for Ethnic Minorities' Earnings." *Work and Occupations* 46(1):45–89.

Durkheim, Emile. 1982. *The Rules of Sociological Method*. 1st American ed. New York: Free Press.

England, Paula, Carmen Garcia-Beaulieu, and Mary Ross. 2004. "Women's Employment among Blacks, Whites, and Three Groups of Latinas: Do More Privileged Women Have Higher Employment?" *Gender & Society* 18(4):494–509.

England, Paula, Melissa S. Herbert, Barbara Stanek Kilbourne, Lori L. Reid, and Lori McCreary Megdal. 1994. "The Gendered Valuation of Occupations and Skills: Earnings in 1980 Census Occupations." *Social Forces* 73(1):65–100.

Feliciano, Cynthia. 2005a. “Does Selective Migration Matter? Explaining Ethnic Disparities in Educational Attainment among Immigrants’Children1.” *International Migration Review* 39(4):841–71.

Feliciano, Cynthia. 2005b. “Educational Selectivity in U.S. Immigration: How Do Immigrants Compare to Those Left Behind?” *Demography* 42(1):131–52.

Feliciano, Cynthia, and Yader R. Lanuza. 2017. “An Immigrant Paradox? Contextual Attainment and Intergenerational Educational Mobility.” *American Sociological Review* 82(1):211–41.

Fellini, Ivana, and Raffaele Guetto. 2019. “A ‘U-Shaped’ Pattern of Immigrants’ Occupational Careers? A Comparative Analysis of Italy, Spain, and France.” *International Migration Review* 53(1):26–58.

Fernandez Kelly, M. Patricia, and Richard Schauffler. 1996. “Divided Fates: Immigrant Children and the New Assimilation.” Pp. 30–53 in *The New Second Generation*, edited by A. Portes. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Ganderton, Philip T., and Richard Santos. 1995. “Hispanic College Attendance and Completion: Evidence from the High School and beyond Surveys.” *Economics of Education Review* 14(1):35–46.

Glick, Jennifer E., and Michael J. White. 2003. “Academic Trajectories of Immigrant Youths: Analysis within and across Cohorts.” *Demography* 40(4):759–83.

Heizmann, Boris, Anne Busch-Heizmann, and Elke Holst. 2017. “Immigrant Occupational Composition and the Earnings of Immigrants and Natives in Germany: Sorting or Devaluation?” *International Migration Review* 51(2):475–505.

Hughes, Christina. 2019. “Reexamining the Influence of Conditional Cash Transfers on Migration From a Gendered Lens.” *Demography* 56(5):1573–1605.

Hummer, Robert A., Daniel A. Powers, Starling G. Pullum, Ginger L. Gossman, and W. Parker Frisbie. 2007. “Paradox Found (Again): Infant Mortality among the Mexican-Origin Population in the United States.” *Demography* 44(3):441–57.

Jacobs, Jerry A. 1996. “Gender Inequality and Higher Education.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 22:153.

John, Mauricia. 2019. “Cuban and Afro-Caribbean Immigrants: An Analysis of Intermarriage and Subsequent Assimilation among Second-Generation Caribbean Immigrants.” *Migration and Development* 0(0):1–20.

Lee, Jennifer, and Min Zhou. 2015. *The Asian American Achievement Paradox*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lester, Jaime, and Carrie Klein. 2017. "Setting the Stage: Broadly Considering Gender Constructions." in *Constructions of Gender, CC 179: New Directions for Community Colleges,* edited by P. L. Eddy. Newark, United States: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.

McManus, Patricia A., and Lauren Apgar. 2019. "Parental Origins, Mixed Unions, and the Labor Supply of Second-Generation Women in the United States." *Demography* 56(1):49–73.

Painter, Matthew A., and Matthew R. Sanderson. 2017. "Different Country, Same Work: The Income Advantage of Industrial Channeling Among Mexican Immigrants." *Work and Occupations* 44(2):210–32.

Pedraza, Silvia. 1991. "Women and Migration: The Social Consequences of Gender." *Annual Review of Sociology* 17(1):303–25.

Pessar, Patricia R. 1999. "Engendering Migration Studies: The Case of New Immigrants in the United States." *American Behavioral Scientist* 42(4):577–600.

Pessar, Patricia R., and Sarah J. Mahler. 2003. "Transnational Migration: Bringing Gender In." *International Migration Review* 37(3):812–46.

Portes, Alejandro, ed. 1996. *The New Second Generation*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2006. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. 3rd ed. University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro, and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530(1):74–96.

Powers, Daniel A. 2013. "Paradox Revisited: A Further Investigation of Racial/Ethnic Differences in Infant Mortality by Maternal Age." *Demography* 50(2):495–520.

Rosenfeld, Rachel A., and Gunn Elisabeth Birkelund. 1995. "Women's Part-Time Work: A Cross-National Comparison." *European Sociological Review* 11(2):111–34.

Ryan, Camille L., and Kurt Bauman. 2016. *Educational Attainment in the United States: 2015*. P20-578. U.S. Census Bureau.

Sandy, Jonathan, Arturo Gonzalez, and Michael J. Hilmer. 2006. “Alternative Paths to College Completion: Effect of Attending a 2-Year School on the Probability of Completing a 4-Year Degree.” *Economics of Education Review* 25(5):463–71.

Thomson, Maria D., and Laurie Hoffman-Goetz. 2009. “Defining and Measuring Acculturation: A Systematic Review of Public Health Studies with Hispanic Populations in the United States.” *Social Science & Medicine* 69(7):983–91.

Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald, Martin Hällsten, and Dustin Avent-Holt. 2015. “Where Do Immigrants Fare Worse? Modeling Workplace Wage Gap Variation with Longitudinal Employer-Employee Data.” *American Journal of Sociology* 120(4):1095–1143.

Villarreal, Andrés, and Christopher R. Tamborini. 2018. “Immigrants’ Economic Assimilation: Evidence from Longitudinal Earnings Records.” *American Sociological Review* 83(4):686–715.

Waters, Mary C., Van C. Tran, Philip Kasinitz, and John H. Mollenkopf. 2010. “Segmented Assimilation Revisited: Types of Acculturation and Socioeconomic Mobility in Young Adulthood.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 33(7):1168–93.

White, Michael J., and Jennifer E. Glick, eds. 2009. “School:: Educational Attainment of Immigrants and the Second Generation.” Pp. 78–111 in *Achieving Anew, How New Immigrants Do in American Schools, Jobs, and Neighborhoods*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Williams, Christine L. 1992. “The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in the ‘Female’ Professions.” *Social Problems* 39(3):253–67.